



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/808,543	03/14/2001	Joseph Robert Marchese	P-3001-2 JDS	3819
29318	7590	10/21/2003	EXAMINER	
JAMES D. STEVENS REISING, ETHINGTON, BARNES, KISSELLE, ET AL P.O. BOX 4390 TROY, MI 48099			HENN, TIMOTHY J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2612	
DATE MAILED: 10/21/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/808,543	MARCHESE, JOSEPH ROBERT
	Examiner Timothy J Henn	Art Unit 2612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 March 2001.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-10,13-29,31-37,40-51,53-54 and 56-62 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 11,12,30,38,39,50-52 and 55 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 14 March 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
 - i. Page 5, line 22: "concatenated" is misspelled "concatentated".
 - ii. Page 12, line 12: Figure number is missing in "hardware setup process of Fig. using".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 30 and 50 are objected to because of the following informalities:
 - i. In regard to claim 30: there is a period missing after the claim number.
 - ii. In regard to claim 50, on line 20: "concatenated" is misspelled "concatentated"

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2612

4. Claims 1-5, 7-8 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Webcam Watcher v1.2 (November 1999).
5. In regard to claim 1, note that Webcam Watcher, which runs on well known personal computers, comprises a digital storage device, a user interface program which is operable to access camera data uniquely identifying the cameras and to attempt to access the cameras over a network using camera data and to verify access to those ones of the cameras that are accessible over the network and to generate a user interface display on the computer that includes a display window for each of the cameras accessed over the network and to display in each of the display windows an image received from the camera associated with that display window as claimed.
6. In regard to claim 2, note that Webcam Watcher is operable to sequentially access each of the cameras that are accessible over the network and update the image displayed in the window associated with each accessed camera using an updated image received from that camera as claimed.
7. In regard to claim 3, note that Webcam Watcher is operable to sequentially update the display windows using the updated images received from the cameras associated with those windows as claimed.
8. In regard to claim 4, note that Webcam Watcher's auto-update feature is operable to sequentially highlight each display window as it is being updated as claimed.
9. In regard to claim 5, note that Webcam Watcher is operable to sequentially poll each of the cameras that are accessible over the network and to update the display

window with a polled camera using an updated image received from the camera as claimed.

10. In regard to claim 7, note that Webcam Watcher is operable to permit a user of the computer to select the number of display windows included in the user interface display as claimed.

11. In regard to claim 8, note that Webcam Watcher is operable to receive images as image files in which the images are represented using a graphics file format.

12. In regard to claim 18, note that Webcam Watcher is operable to launch a separate process that is itself operable to open a connection to a selected one of the cameras using a network protocol supported by the network and to initiate streaming of images from the selected camera as claimed.

13. In regard to claim 19, note that Webcam Watcher is operable to access a plurality of remote cameras via a video server connected between the remote cameras and the network as claimed.

14. Claims 31-35 and 40-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Enright et al. (US 6,583,813).

15. In regard to claim 31, note that Enright et al. discloses a system comprising a digital storage device (Figure 2, item 42; Column 12, lines 7-9), a program being operable upon execution by the computer to select one of the video images as a reference image and another of the video images as a selected image to be compared to the reference image (Columns 17-18, lines 67, 1-2), wherein said program is operable to access a color component value for each of a number of pixels from the

Art Unit: 2612

reference image and for each of a number of corresponding pixels from the selected image, with said program being operable to perform pixel comparisons using the color component values and to generate a motion detect signal when the difference in color component values for corresponding pixels from the reference and selected images differ by more than a pre-selected amount (Column 18, lines 2-17) as claimed.

16. In regard to claim 32, note that Enright et al. discloses a program which is operable to generate the motion detect signal only if more than a pre-determined number of corresponding pixels from the reference and selected images have color component values that differ by more than the pre-selected amount (Column 18, lines 2-17) as claimed.

17. In regard to claim 33, note that Enright et al. discloses a program that is operable during comparison of the selected and reference images to maintain a count of the number of pixels for which the difference in the color component values for corresponding pixels from the reference and selected images differ by more than the pre-selected amount (Column 18, lines 2-17) as claimed.

18. In regard to claim 34, note that Enright et al. discloses a program that is operable to generate the motion detect signal when the count exceeds a predetermined number (Column 18, lines 2-17) as claimed.

19. In regard to claim 35, note that Enright et al. discloses a program that is operable to permit user selection of the pre-determined number (Column 50-51, lines 58-67, 1-7) as claimed.

20. In regard to claim 40, note that Enright et al. discloses a program that is operable during receipt of the video images by the computer to compare the video images with the reference image as those video images are received by the computer, whereby said program provides real time motion detection processing of the received images (Column 18, lines 2-7) as claimed.

21. In regard to claim 41, note that Enright et al. discloses a program that is operable to periodically select a new reference images from the video images being received by the computer (Columns 17-18, lines 67, 1-2) as claimed.

22. In regard to claim 42, note that Enright et al. discloses a program that is operable to perform the pixel comparisons only for those pixels located within a region of the reference and selected images (Column 50, lines 37-44) as claimed.

23. In regard to claim 43, note that Enright et al. discloses a program that is operable to provide a permit a user to specify the region using a mask (Figure 50; Column 50, lines 25-37) as claimed.

24. In regard to claim 44, note that Enright et al. discloses a program that is operable to provide a display window containing one of the images and to enable the user to create the mask by erasing a portion of the image contained in the display window (Figure 50; Column 50, lines 25-37) as claimed.

25. In regard to claim 45, note that Enright et al. discloses a program that is operable to begin recording of the video images in response to the motion detect signal (Figure 52; Column 51-52, lines 46-67, 1-2) as claimed.

26. In regard to claim 46, note that Enright et al. discloses a program that is operable to operate to continue the comparison of the reference image with the selected images during recording of the video image (Column 51-52, lines 46-67, 1-2: note that motion detection is never stopped during this process) as claimed.
27. In regard to claim 47, note that Enright et al. discloses a program that is operable to stop recording after no further motion is detected using the pixel comparisons (Column 51-52, lines 46-67, 102: note that after the motion detect trigger ends, recording can be programmed to end) as claimed.
28. In regard to claim 48, note that Enright et al. discloses a program that is operable to stop recording after no further motion is detected and a specified number of extra images have been recorded (Figure 52; Column 51-52, lines 46-67, 1-2: note that after the motion detect trigger ends, the camera can be programmed to stop recording after a specified time or "number of extra images") as claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

29. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

30. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webcam Watcher v1.2 (November 1999) in view of MICROSOFT WINDOWS' "tile windows" function.

31. In regard to claim 6, note that Webcam Watcher is able to scale images based on window size. Therefore it can be seen that Webcam Watcher lacks operability to scale the window size based upon the number of current open display windows. MICROSOFT WINDOWS' "tile windows" function allows one to conveniently scale all open windows into a grid that uses the entire display area available to the user, this feature has been available since at least WINDOWS v3.1 and its use is commonly known in the computer art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the use of the "tile windows" feature with the Webcam Watcher software to allow a user to scale currently open windows so as to form a grid display and as a result, scale the images being displayed in those windows based upon the number of display windows active as claimed.

32. Claims 9-10 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webcam Watcher v1.2 (November 1999) in view of Enright et al (US 6,583,813).

33. In regard to claim 9, note that Webcam Watcher v1.2 discloses a program which meets the requirements set forth in claim 1 as discussed above. Therefore it can be seen that Webcam Watcher lacks a compression utility to compress images. Enright et al. teaches that compressing images can "minimize the amount of storage required for holding" (Column 15, lines 1-3) images. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the compression component from Enright et al. with the Webcam Watcher software to minimize storage requirements for storing images.

Art Unit: 2612

34. In regard to claim 10, note that the compression component of Enright et al. allows the user to see the degree of data compression (Column 15, lines 5-9) as claimed.

35. In regard to claim 27, note that Webcam Watcher v1.2 discloses a program which meets the requirements set forth in claim 1 as discussed above. Therefore it can be seen that Webcam Watcher lacks the ability to detect motion in a sequence of images received by a camera by processing color component information contained in the images. Enright et al. discloses a camera system with motion detection based on color component information in order to allow the camera to "have images captured at different rates" (Column 2, lines 52-55) based on whether or not motion is detected in the field of view of the camera or not. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the motion detection Enright et al. with the Webcam Watcher software to allow the software to capture images at different rates based on whether or not motion is detected within the field of view of the camera.

36. In regard to claim 28, note that Enright et al. discloses a system which is operable to store a first image from a sequence as a reference image and to compare color component values for pixels from one or more subsequent images in the sequence to the color component values of corresponding pixels in the reference image (Column 18, lines 2-7) as claimed.

37. In regard to claim 29, note that Enright et al. discloses a system which is operable to maintain a count of the number of pixels for which the difference in color

Art Unit: 2612

component values for corresponding pixels from the reference and selected images differ by more than the pre-selected amount (Column 18, lines 2-7) as claimed.

38. Claims 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webcam Watcher v1.2 (November 1999) in view of HTTP/1.1 (RFC 2608).

39. In regard to claim 13, note that Webcam Watcher v1.2 discloses a program which meets the requirements set forth in claim 1 as discussed above. Therefore it can be seen that Webcam Watcher lacks the ability to open a connection, stream images from said connection, pause said connection and later resume said connection and resume streaming of images from said connection, instead Webcam Watcher opens and closes each connection between streaming of images from cameras. RFC 2608 teaches that the use of persistent connections, which are not immediately closed and can be reused at later times, can save CPU time and help reduce network congestion (Section 8.1.1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the persistent connections as recommended in RFC 2608 with the Webcam Watcher software to reduce CPU time and network congestion when using Webcam Watcher.

40. In regard to claim 14, note that Webcam Watcher terminates the streaming of images temporarily following each received image from a selected camera by closing the connection to the selected camera, if the persistent connections of RFC 2608 were used the streaming of images would instead be paused and the connection would remain active in a paused state.

41. In regard to claim 15, note that Webcam Watcher is operable to access images from a plurality of other cameras before returning to a specific camera to update images from this. During this time, if the persistent connections of RFC 2608 were to be used the connection made would remain active and in a paused state.

42. In regard to claim 16, note that Webcam Watcher cycles through a plurality of selected cameras, opening a connection, streaming images and closing the connection. If the persistent connections of RFC 2608 were used, the connections would be paused instead of closed before moving to the next camera, and the connections would be reused the next time the cycle would be completed as claimed.

43. In regard to claim 17, note that Webcam Watcher software and the persistent connections of 2608 are commonly implemented over an Ethernet network using TCP/IP (Official Notice).

44. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webcam Watcher v1.2 (November 1999) in view of Compton et al. (US 6,115,035).

45. In regard to claim 20, note that Webcam Watcher v1.2 discloses a program which meets the requirements set forth in claim 1 as discussed above, also note that Webcam Watcher stores the received images in a directory which is unique to each camera. Therefore it can be seen that Webcam Watcher lacks a subdirectory that is identified according to date information that relates to when the image was stored. Compton et al. discloses a media storage system that includes subdirectories based on date information (Column 4, lines 1-7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the date based subdirectory

storage system of Compton et al. with the Webcam Watcher software to allow users to browse images in based on the dates that they were created.

46. Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webcam Watcher v1.2 (November 1999) in view of Tar.

47. In regard to claim 21, note that Webcam Watcher v1.2 discloses a program which meets the requirements set forth in claim 1 as discussed above, also note that Webcam Watcher saves a copy of each image it downloads. Therefore it can be seen that Webcam Watcher is lacking a storage system where individual images are stored together in a single file. Tar teaches an archive system, which comprises files to be archived, concatenated together as claimed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the archive system of Tar with Webcam Watcher to allow storage of a sequences of individual images to be stored together in a single file as claimed.

48. In regard to claim 22, note that Tar stores files by concatenating each image onto the end of the file.

49. Claim 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webcam Watcher v1.2 in view of Tar.

50. Webcam Watcher in view of Tar discloses a system that meets the conditions set forth in claim 22 as discussed above. Therefore it can be seen that Webcam Watcher in view of Tar lacks a system to index the images stored in a file, and to store that index as a separate file. However, the examiner notes that indexing a file in such a manner is essentially no different than creating a simple well-known file system (see for example,

"A Fast File System for UNIX") within the confines of a tar file (Official Notice). A basic computer file system comprises data files, and information describing the data files such as ownership information, date information and pointers to the start and end of the file. This information is commonly stored separately from the file in a special file called a "directory". It is commonly known that indexing files in such a way allows one to quickly access specific data stored within the file system without taking extra time to search the entire file system for the specific file. It is also commonly known that programs which store large amounts of data frequently do so using their own file systems created in files which reside on system file systems to allow the programs greater control over how files are stored and accessed (Official Notice). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a custom file system built on top of the system file system to store the images downloaded by Webcam Watcher in view of Tar to add indexing to allow faster access to specific images as is well-known in the art.

51. In regard to claim 24, note that Webcam Watcher is also an image viewer program, also note that for the custom file system as described in claim 23 above to work, Webcam Watcher or the "image view program" must be operable to index the images within the single file (Official Notice).

52. In regard to claim 25, note that file systems contain pointers to the start of data or "start of image" and end of data or "end of image" markers located on the file system or "single file".

Art Unit: 2612

53. In regard to claim 26, note that in order for a custom file system to be effective, it must use the index to locate individual images within the data file or "said single file" as claimed.

54. Claims 36 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Enright et al. (US 6,583,813) in view of Matsumura et al. (US 6,002,428).

55. In regard to claim 36, Enright et al. discloses a system that meets the requirements set forth in claim 33 as discussed above, also note that Enright et al. calculates the motion detection signal based upon the luminance or color intensity data from a reference and subject image (Column 18, lines 6-8). Therefore it can be seen that Enright et al. lacks a system that maintains a separate counter for each of the different color component values. Matsumura et al. teaches that instead of using YUV color space, "color components of R, G and B may be used" (Column 21, lines 31-37) in motion detection systems. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the color components of R, G and B of Matsumura as the color data used by Enright et al. to create three separate motion detectors for each of the R, G and B components using the counters and threshold levels and claimed.

56. In regard to claim 37, note that Enright uses counters and pre-determined threshold levels in the motion detection system, and generates a motion detect signal when a counter exceeds the threshold level as claimed.

57. Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Enright et al. (US 6,583,83) in view of Tar.

58. In regard to claim 49, Enright et al. discloses a system that meets the requirements set forth in claim 45 as discussed above. Therefore it can be seen that Enright et al. lacks a system, which is operable to concatenate the video images and store them in a single file. Tar implements an archive system, which comprises files to be archived, concatenated together as claimed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the archive system of Tar with the system of Enright et al. to allow Enright et al. to store video images concatenated together in a single file.

59. Claim 50, 53-54, 56-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webcam Watcher v1.2 in view of Tar.

60. In regard to claim 50, note that Webcam Watcher is typically implemented on a well-known personal computer which includes a digital storage device, and that Webcam Watcher is operable to save a sequence of images which are represented in a graphics file format that includes a first marker identifying the start of the image and a second marker identifying the end of the image (inherent to JPEG files). Therefore it can be seen that Webcam Watcher lacks a storage system where the images are stored together as a single file that comprises the images concatenated together in sequential order. Tar implements an archive system, which comprises files to be archived, concatenated together as claimed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the archive system of Tar with the system of Webcam Watcher to allow Webcam Watcher to store video images concatenated together in a single file. However, it can be seen that

Webcam Watcher in view of Tar lacks operability to index the file using the first and second markers. However, the examiner notes that indexing a file in such a manner is essentially no different than creating a simple well-known file system (see for example, "A Fast File System for UNIX") within the confines of a tar file (Official Notice). A basic computer file system comprises data files, and information describing the data files such as ownership information, date information and pointers to the start and end of the file. This information is commonly stored separately from the file in a special file called a "directory". It is commonly known that indexing files in such a way allows one to quickly access specific data stored within the file system without taking extra time to search the entire file system for the specific file. It is also commonly known that programs which store large amounts of data frequently do so using their own file systems created in files which reside on system file systems to allow the programs greater control over how files are stored and accessed (Official Notice). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a custom file system built on top of the system file system to store the images downloaded by Webcam Watcher in view of Tar to add indexing to allow faster access to specific images as is well-known in the art.

61. In regard to claim 53, note that in order for a custom file system to be effective, it must use the index to locate individual images within the data file or "said single file" as claimed.

62. In regard to claim 54, note that Webcam Watcher is operable to display individual images on a computer as claimed.

Art Unit: 2612

63. In regard to claim 56, note that start of image (FF D8) and end of image (FF D9) are required to be included in standard JPG files as claimed.

64. In regard to claim 57, note that a file system as described above contains pointers to the start of data of a file or start of image marker and end of data or end of image marker within the index file as claimed.

65. In regard to claim 58, note that Webcam Watcher commonly uses JPG files and that Tar is operable to concatenate the incoming images together into a single data file as claimed.

66. Claims 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webcam Watcher v1.2 in view of Tar as applied to claim 50 above, and further in view of Enright et al.

67. In regard to claim 51, Webcam Watcher v1.2 in view of Tar discloses a system which meets the requirements set forth in claim 50 as discuss above. Therefore it can be seen that Webcam Watcher v1.2 in view of Tar lacks the operability to store digital video files on a data storage device. Enright et al. discloses a system, which allows for a series of images to be stored in the AVI video format if the user so chooses (Figure 45; Column 48, lines 2-5) to allow for capture of full motion video to be saved in a digital format. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the AVI capture ability of Enright et al. with the system of Webcam Watch in view of Tar to allow the system to capture full motion video and save it in a digital format as claimed.

Art Unit: 2612

68. Claims 59-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webcam Watcher in view of the applicants admitted prior art.

69. In regard to claim 59, note Webcam Watcher is typically implemented on a well-known personal computer or "client computer" and is operable to provide a user interface display on the computer that includes a display window for each of the cameras accessed over a network and displays in each of the display windows an image received from the camera associated with that display window. Therefore it can be seen that Webcam Watcher lacks one or more video servers accessible by the client computer over the network and a plurality of cameras connected to the video servers, said video servers providing an interface between the cameras and client computer in which images from the cameras are accessed by the video servers and then sent to the client computer upon request by the client computer. The applicants admitted prior art discloses camera servers which can be accessed over a network (page 2, lines 13-22) and provide the client computer with images from the cameras upon request (page 3, lines 4-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the video servers of the applicants admitted prior art with the Webcam Watcher software to produce a video system, which allows remote surveillance over a computer network without the need for analog storage devices.

70. In regard to claim 60, note that Webcam Watcher can access a plurality of video servers as claimed.

71. In regard to claim 61, note that the applicants admitted prior art includes a "camera server that is a complete product containing both a camera and a web server" (page 2, lines 23-24) as claimed.

72. In regard to claim 62, note that the applicants admitted prior art includes "a component based video server with inputs for one or more analog video feeds" (page 2, lines 25-26) or "a multi-camera video server connected to at least two of the cameras" as claimed.

Allowable Subject Matter

73. Claims 11-12, 30, 38-39, 52 and 55 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

74. In regard to claims 11 and 12, the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a program used for the monitoring of Internet cameras that is operable to monitor the network for a trigger event generated by one of the cameras.

75. In regard to claim 30, the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a program which is operable in response to user selection of a display window to display a form that permits the user to initiate recording of images from the camera associated with that display window.

76. In regard to claims 38 and 39, the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a motion detection system with minimum thresholds and counters for the number of changed pixels as determined by comparing the color component values of a reference

and a subject image, wherein the different color component values comprise RGB component values, each of which has its own offset and minimum count.

77. In regard to claim 52, the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a program used for the monitoring of Internet cameras which stores images as a single file of images concatenated together and keep a separate index of images located within the separate file, and wherein the program is operable to automatically index the digital video files on a periodic basis.

78. In regard to claim 55, the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a program used for the monitoring of Internet cameras which stores images as a single file of images concatenated together and keep a separate index of images located within the separate file, and wherein the program is operable upon user selection of the single file to search for the index and, if not found, is further operable to create the index.

Conclusion

79. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. The following prior art further shows the current state of the art in motion

detection systems:

- i. Miyazaki et al. US 5,786,872
- ii. Abe et al. US 5,512,974
- iii. Kershaw et al. US 5,561,476
- iv. Tanaka et al. US 5,311,306

b. The following prior art further shows the current state of the art in image

Art Unit: 2612

storage and retrieval systems.

i. Hoffman US 5,761,655

c. The following prior art further shows the current state of the art in pausing streaming connections:

i. Boys US 6,516,340

d. The following prior art further shows the current state of the art in archiving multiple files into one:

i. ar Solaris 2.4 man pages: ar(1), ar(4)

e. The following prior art further shows the current state of the art in file systems:

i. McKusick et al. "A Fast File System for UNIX"

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Timothy J Henn whose telephone number is (703) 305-8327. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 AM - 5:00 PM, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wendy R Garber can be reached on (703) 305-4929. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Application/Control Number: 09/808,543
Art Unit: 2612

Page 22

Timothy James Henn
August 27, 2003



NGOC-YEN VU
PRIMARY EXAMINER